

Observations on a certain theorem of Fermat and on others concerning prime numbers*

Leonhard Euler

It is known that the quantity $a^n + 1$ always has divisors whenever n is an odd number or is divisible by an odd number aside from unity.¹ Namely $a^{2m+1} + 1$ can be divided by $a + 1$ and $a^{p(2m+1)} + 1$ by $a^p + 1$, for whatever number is substituted in place of a . But on the other hand, if n is a number which is divisible by no odd number aside from unity, which happens when n is a power of two, no divisor of the number $a^n + 1$ can be assigned.² So if there are prime number of this form $a^n + 1$, they must all necessarily be included in the form $a^{2^m} + 1$. But it cannot however be concluded from this that $a^{2^m} + 1$ always exhibits a prime number for any a ; for it is clear first that if a is an odd number, this form will have the divisor 2. Then also, even if a denotes an even number, innumerable cases can still be given in which a composite number results. For instance, the formula $a^2 + 1$ can be divided by 5 whenever $a = 5b \pm 3$, and $30^2 + 1$ can be divided by 17, and $50^2 + 1$ by 41. Similarly, $10^4 + 1$ has the divisor 73, $6^8 + 1$ has the divisor 17, and $6^{128} + 1$ is divisible by 257. Yet no case has been found where any divisor of this form $2^{2^m} + 1$ occurs, however far we have checked in the table of prime numbers, which indeed does not extend beyond 100000. For this and perhaps other reasons, Fermat was led to state there to be no doubt that $2^{2^m} + 1$ is always a prime number, and proposed this eminent theorem to Wallis and other English Mathematicians for demonstration. Indeed he admits to not himself have a demonstration of this, but did not however hold it to be any less than completely true. He also praised the great utility of this, by means of which one can easily exhibit a prime number larger than any given number, which without a universal theorem of this type would be very difficult. This is assembled in the penultimate letter in the *Commercium Epistolicum*,

*Presented to the St. Petersburg Academy on September 26, 1732. Originally published as *Observationes de theoremate quodam Fermatiano aliisque ad numeros primos spectantibus*, *Commentarii academiae scientiarum Petropolitanae* **6** (1738), 103–107. E26 in the Eneström index. Translated from the Latin by Jordan Bell, Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Email: jordan.bell@gmail.com

¹Translator: If $n = kl$ then $a^n + 1$ is divisible by

$$\frac{a^{kl}}{a^l} = a^{(k-1)l} - a^{(k-2)l} + \dots + 1.$$

See Chapter II of Hardy and Wright.

²Translator: Euler probably means that there is no general form for a divisor.

included in the second volume of the *Opera* of Wallis.³ They are also recorded on p. 115 of the works of Fermat, as follows: “For I have said that numbers made by squaring two and adding unity always lead to prime numbers, namely that 3, 5, 17, 257, 65537 etc. to infinity are prime, and the truth of this theorem has already been shown by Analysts with no difficulty etc.”

The truth of this theorem can be seen, as I have already said, if one takes 1, 2, 3 and 4 for m ; for these yields the numbers 5, 7, 257 and 65537, which all occur among the prime numbers in the table. But I do not know by what fate it turned out that the number immediately following, $2^{2^5} + 1$, ceases to be a prime number; for I have observed after thinking about this for many days that this number can be divided by 641, which can be seen at once by anyone who cares to check. For it is $2^{2^5} + 1 = 2^{32} + 1 = 4294967297$. From this it can be understood that the theorem fails in this and even in other cases which follow, and hence the problem of finding a prime number greater than a given number still remains unsolved.

I will now examine also the formula $2^n - 1$, which, whenever n is not a prime number, has divisors, and not only $2^n - 1$, but also $a^n - 1$. But if n is a prime number, it might seem that $2^n - 1$ also always gives a prime; this however no one, as far as I know, has dared to profess, and indeed it can easily be refuted. Namely $2^{11} - 1$, i.e. 2047, has the divisors 23 and 89, and $2^{23} - 1$ can be divided by 47. I see also that the Cel. Wolff has not only not mentioned this in the new edition of his *Elem. Matheseos*, where he investigates the perfect numbers and includes 2047 among the primes, but also has 511 or $2^9 - 1$ as a prime, while it is divisible by $2^3 - 1$, i.e. 7. He also gives that $2^{n-1}(2^n - 1)$ is a perfect number whenever $2^n - 1$ is prime; therefore n must also be a prime number. I have found it a worthwhile effort to examine those cases in which $2^n - 1$ is not a prime number while n is. I have also found that $n = 4m - 1$ and $8m - 1$ are prime numbers, then $2^n - 1$ can always be divided by $8m - 1$. Hence the following cases should be excluded: 11, 23, 83, 131, 179, 191, 239 etc., which numbers when substituted for n yield $2^n - 1$ that is a composite number. Neither however can all the remaining prime numbers be successfully put in place of n , but still more must be removed; thus I have observed that $2^{37} - 1$ can be divided by 223, $2^{43} - 1$ by 431, $2^{29} - 1$ by 1103, $2^{73} - 1$ by 439; however it is not in our power to exclude them all. Still, I venture to assert that except for those cases noted, all prime numbers less than 50 and perhaps even 100 yield $2^{n-1}(2^n - 1)$ which is a perfect number, thus 11 perfect numbers arise from the following numbers taken for n , 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 17, 19, 31, 41, 47. I have deduced these observations from a not inelegant theorem, whose proof I do not have, but indeed of whose truth I am completely certain. This theorem is: *$a^n - b^n$ can always be divided by $n + 1$, if $n + 1$ is any prime number which divides neither a or b* ; I believe this demonstration is more difficult because it is not true unless $n + 1$ is a prime number. From this theorem, it follows at once that $2^n - 1$ can always be divided

³Translator: See Chapter III, §IV of Weil, *Number theory: an approach through history from Hammurapi to Legendre*.

by $n+1$ if $n+1$ is a prime number, or, since each prime aside from 2 is odd, and as $a = 2$ that case does not happen because of the conditions of the theorem,⁴ $2^{2^m} - 1$ will always be able to be divided by $2m+1$ if $2m+1$ is a prime number. Hence either $2^m + 1$ or $2^m - 1$ will be able to be divided by $2m+1$.⁵ I have also discovered that $2^m + 1$ can be divided if $m = 4p+1$ or $4p+2$; while $2^m - 1$ will have the divisor $2m+1$ if $m = 4p$ or $4p-1$. I have happened upon many other theorems in this pursuit which are no less elegant, which I believe should be further investigated, because either they cannot be demonstrated themselves, or they follow from propositions which cannot be demonstrated; some which seem important are appended here.

Theorem 1

If n is a prime number, all powers having the exponent $n-1$ leave either nothing or 1 when divided by n .

Theorem 2

With n still a prime number, every power whose exponent is $n^{m-1}(n-1)$ leaves either 0 or 1 when divided by n^m .

Theorem 3

Let m, n, p, q etc be distinct prime numbers and let A be the least common multiple of them decreased by unity, think of them $m-1, n-1, p-1, q-1$ etc.; with this done, I say that any power of the exponent A , like a^A , divided by $mnpq$ etc. will leave either 0 or 1, unless a can be divided by one of the numbers m, n, p, q etc.

Theorem 4

With $2n+1$ denoting a prime number, $3^n + 1$ will be able to be divided by $2n+1$, if either $n = 6p+2$ or $n = 6p+3$; while $3^n - 1$ will be able to be divided by $2n+1$ if either $n = 6p$ or $n = 6p-1$.

Theorem 5

$3^n + 2^n$ can be divided by $2n+1$ if $n = 12p+3, 12p+5, 12p+6$ or $12p+8$, And $3^n - 2^n$ can be divided by $2n+1$ if $n = 12, 12p+2, 12p+9$ or $12p+11$.

⁴Translator: If $n+1 = 2$ then $n+1$ divides a .

⁵Translator: $2^{2^m-1} = (2^m + 1)(2^m - 1)$, and since $2m+1$ is prime and divides 2^{2^m-1} , it must divide one of the factors.

Theorem 6

Under the same conditions which held for $3^n + 2^n$, $6^n + 1$ can also be divided by $2n + 1$; and $6^n - 1$ under those which held for $3^n - 2^n$.